

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Jacob Christopher Gunn,

Plaintiff

Case No.: 2:19-cv-00197-JAD-NJK

1

Romeo Aranas, et al.,

Defendants

Order Dismissing Action

Plaintiff Jacob Christopher Gunn brings this civil-rights case under § 1983 for events he alleges occurred during his incarceration at the Southern Desert Correctional Center. On February 4, 2019, the Court directed Gunn to file a fully completed application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the \$400 filing fee.¹ The Court expressly warned him that his failure to file the completed application or pay the filing fee by March 6, 2019, would result in the dismissal of this case.² The deadline has passed, and Gunn has not responded to the Court’s order.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.³ A court may dismiss an action with prejudice based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.⁴ In determining whether to

¹ ECF No. 3 (order).

$$|^2 Id,$$

³ *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

⁴ See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440–41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir.

1 dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with
2 local rules, the court must consider several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious
3 resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the
4 defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the
5 availability of less drastic alternatives.⁵

6 I find that the first two factors—the public's interest in expeditiously resolving the
7 litigation and the court's interest in managing the docket—weigh in favor of dismissing this case.
8 The risk-of-prejudice factor also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury
9 arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or
10 prosecuting an action.⁶ The fourth factor is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of
11 dismissal, and a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey the court's order will result in
12 dismissal satisfies the consideration-of-alternatives requirement.⁷ Gunn was warned that his case
13 would be dismissed if he failed to pay the fee or submit a completed application by March 6,
14 2019.⁸ So, Gunn had adequate warning that his failure to pay the fee or submit a completed
15 application would result in this case's dismissal.

16 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **this action is DISMISSED** without
17 prejudice based on Gunn's failure to pay the fee or submit a completed application in compliance
18 with this Court's February 4, 2019, order; and

19 ///

20
21 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421,
22 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

23 ⁵ *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423–24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130;
24 *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260–61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

25 ⁶ See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

26 ⁷ *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132–33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

27 ⁸ ECF No. 3 (order).

The Clerk of Court is directed to ENTER JUDGMENT accordingly and CLOSE THIS CASE.

Dated: March 25, 2019

